



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/323,206	06/01/1999	WILLIAM R. BANDY	1689.0010001 8893		
7:	590 05/24/2004		EXAMI	INER	
STERNE KESSLER GOLDSTEIN AND FOX PLLC			MYHRE, JAMES W		
	ORK AVENUE NW SUIT N. DC 200053934	E 600	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,		3622		
			DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			:		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/323,206	BANDY ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	James W Myhre	3622			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 01 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION.	See MPEP		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.		
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

10. Other: ____

Claim(s) allowed: 92-99,101-103,106-117 and 158-160.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: <u>104 and 118-157</u>.

Advisory Action

8. \square The drawing correction filed on ____ is a) \square approved or b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Part of Paper No. 20040519

ames W. Myhre Primary Examiner Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: "time slot contention" is interpreted as two or more tags responding "at the same time". Both Walter and Werb discuss how to prevent or overcome situations in which more than one tag responds at the same time. Thus, they are concerned with avoiding "time slot contention"..